



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

conviction. Pending the hearing of the appeal he escaped. On motion of the Attorney-General an order was issued that the appeal stand dismissed unless the defendant shall within thirty days return to custody.

EVIDENCE—CROSS-EXAMINATION.—*DAY v. DONOHUE*, 41 Atl. 934 (N. J.).—Defendant, who was a master, being sued for negligence in furnishing material for a scaffold, gave testimony which tended to show he had used ordinary care. On cross-examination he was asked if he was insured against loss in case the verdict went against him. *Held*, that it was within the discretion of the trial court to allow the question. Van Syckel and Depue, J. J., dissented on the ground that such testimony was immaterial and irrelevant.

EVIDENCE—CROSS-EXAMINATION.—*PEOPLE v. DOLE*, 55 Pac. 581 (Cal.).—Defendant on trial for forging a check testified in his own behalf that he won the check in a game of poker. On cross-examination he was asked whether he had stated this to the person who arrested him, or to the officer in whose custody he was placed, or to the person who informed him of the particular charge against him. *Held*, that such question was proper. McFarland, Henshaw and Temple, J. J., dissented on the ground that a man's silence to his jailors can not be used against him.

INSOLVENCY—POWER OF ASSIGNEE—UNRECORDED MORTGAGE.—*NEWTOWN SAVINGS BANK v. LAWRENCE, ET AL*, 41 Atl. 1054 (Conn.).—Under Conn. G. S., § 2961, providing that no conveyance shall be effectual to hold lands against any other person but the grantor and his heirs unless recorded, the assignee in insolvency of the grantor may sell property free from an unrecorded mortgage made by his assignor. Andrews, C. J., and Hammersley, J., dissented.

LIFE INSURANCE—CONTRACTS—FRAUDS—RECISSION—NEGLIGENCE.—*MCCARTY v. N. Y. LIFE INS. CO.*, 77 N.W. Rep. 26 (Minn.).—An agent of the insurance company solicited the plaintiff to take out a policy of insurance upon his life, stating the character and terms of the policy. Plaintiff agreed to take one of the kind and terms described by the agent. Thereupon the agent filled out an "application" and presented it to plaintiff for his signature; falsely representing to him that it was an application for a policy of the character and terms which he had described. Plaintiff signed the application without reading it, in reliance upon the representations of the agent, and gave his promissory note in payment of the premium. He did not read the policy for six weeks, when, upon discovering that the terms were materially different from what they had been represented to be by the agent, he immediately returned the policy, requesting that they cancel it and return to him his note. The company refused and transferred the note to an innocent indorsee, who recovered, and the plaintiff thereupon brought suit to recover the value of the note. *Held*, notwithstanding there was a stipulation requiring an alteration of one of their policies to be put in writing, and submitted to the home office to render it valid, plaintiff could recover. *Insurance Co. v. Fletcher*, 117 U. S. 519, O. Sup. Ct. 837, distinguished. Negligence is not a good defense in an action of fraud between the original parties to the contract. As to the contention that the parties could not be placed in *statu quo*, plaintiff having been insured for six weeks, and that the only remedy was an action for deceit, the court held that where one party has obtained an unconscionable advantage over another by fraud, and a recission would be in furtherance of justice, a recission may still be had,